

**REMARKS**

No claims have been amended. Claims 1-17, 19-35, 37-47, and 49-79 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of the application and furtherance onto issuance.

**§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 4, 6-13, 19, 22, 24-31, 37, 42, 44-47, 49-54, 64, 68 and 70-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,389,455 to Fuisz (hereinafter "Fuisz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,857 to Gupta et al. (hereinafter "Gupta").

Claims 2, 20, 38, 55-63 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fuisz-Gupta in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0010665 A1 to Lefebvre et al. (hereinafter "Lefebvre").

Claims 3, 5, 14-17, 21, 23, 32-35, 41, 43, 67, 69 and 78-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fuisz-Gupta in view of Connolly (Hypertext Markup Language – 2.0).

Claims 39-40 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fuisz-Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,720 to Morelli (hereinafter "Morelli")

Claims 1-17

Claim 1 recites a method of formatting a message for exchange between entities on a network, the method comprising:

- generating a message envelope;
- generating contents of the message envelope, the contents comprising data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for the entity to perform a task.* (Emphasis added).

Fuisz does not teach or suggest that at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for the entity to perform a task. The Office acknowledges that Fuisz does not describe such, and cites Gupta as curing the deficiencies of Fuisz (Office Action p. 3).

However, Gupta fails to cure the deficiencies of Fuisz, as Gupta does not teach or suggest that at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for that entity to perform a task, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Gupta describes inserting "thru-proxy tags" into a message to dynamically alter the path by which the message is communicated, and/or to identify a destination for the message. These "thru-proxy tags" simply describe the path of communication and/or destination of the message, and are not described as including explicit requests for an entity to perform a task. Therefore, although a task may eventually be performed at the final destination, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the "thru-proxy tags" includes an explicit request for the entity to perform a task, as recited in claim 1.

1 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
2 features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
3 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
4 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 1 be  
5 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

6 Claims 4 and 6-13 depend ultimately from independent claim 1, and are  
7 allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta combination for at least the reason described  
8 above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that  
9 the Office withdraw the rejection of each of these dependent claims because the  
10 base claim is allowable.

11 Claim 2 is allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination by virtue  
12 of its dependency upon allowable claim 1. Claim 2 is also allowable over the  
13 Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination because Lefebvre does not address the  
14 deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described above in response to the rejection  
15 of claim 1, and the Office has not cited Lefebvre as curing these deficiencies.

16 Claims 3, 5 and 14-17 are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly  
17 combination by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 1. Claims 3, 5  
18 and 14-17 are also allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly combination because  
19 Connolly does not address the deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described  
20 above in response to the rejection of claim 1, and the Office has not cited Connolly  
21 as curing these deficiencies.

**Claims 19-35**

**Claim 19** recites a method of delivering a message over a network, the method comprising:

- transmitting a message envelope of a message from an origin entity to a destination entity via one or more intermediate entities on the network;
- the message envelope having contents comprising data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for the destination entity to perform a task.* (Emphasis added).

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach or suggest a method of delivering a message where the message envelope has contents comprising data structures in which each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes and explicit request for the destination entity to perform a task.*

As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19 is allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 19 be allowed in the Examiner's next action.

1       **Claims 22 and 24-31** depend ultimately from independent claim 19, and  
2 are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta combination for at least the reason described  
3 above in response to the rejection of claim 19. Applicant respectfully requests that  
4 the Office withdraw the rejection of each of these dependent claims because the  
5 base claim is allowable.

6       **Claim 20** is allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination by  
7 virtue of its dependency upon allowable claim 19. Claim 20 is also allowable over  
8 the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination because Lefebvre does not address the  
9 deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described above in response to the rejection  
10 of claim 1.

11       **Claims 21, 23 and 32-35** are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly  
12 combination by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 19. Claims 21,  
13 23 and 32-35 are also allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly combination  
14 because Connolly does not address the deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as  
15 described above in response to the rejection of claim 1.

16  
17       **Claims 37-47**

18       **Claim 37** recites a method of parsing a message received by a receiving  
19 entity over a network from a sending entity, the method comprising:

- 20       • parsing a message envelope;  
21       • parsing contents of the message envelope, the contents comprising  
22 data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is intended  
23 to process the data structure when that entity receives the message  
24 envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data*  
25 *structures includes an explicit request for the receiving entity to*  
*perform a task.* (Emphasis added).

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
2 arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above, the  
3 Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach a method of parsing a message where the  
4 contents of the message envelope comprise data structures in which each data  
5 structure identifies which entity is intended to process the data structure when that  
6 entity receives the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the*  
7 *data structures includes an explicit request for the receiving entity to perform a*  
8 *task.*

9 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
10 features recited in claim 37. Accordingly, claim 37 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
11 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
12 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 37 be  
13 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

14 Claims 42 and 44-47 depend ultimately from independent claim 37, and  
15 are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta combination for at least the reason described  
16 above in response to the rejection of claim 37. Applicant respectfully requests that  
17 the Office withdraw the rejection of each of these dependent claims because the  
18 base claim is allowable.

19 Claim 38 is allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination by  
20 virtue of its dependency upon allowable claim 37. Claim 38 is also allowable over  
21 the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination because Lefebvre does not address the  
22 deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described above in response to the rejection  
23 of claim 1.

24 Claims 39 and 40 are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Morelli combination  
25 by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 37. Claims 39 and 40 are also

allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Morelli combination because Morelli does not address the deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 41 and 43 are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly combination by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 37. Claims 41 and 43 are also allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly combination because Connolly does not address the deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1.

#### Claim 49

Claim 49 recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a method of formatting a message for exchange between entities on a network, the method comprising:

- generating a message envelope;
- generating contents of the message envelope, the contents comprising data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for that entity to perform a task.* (Emphasis added).

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach or suggest a method in which the contents of a message envelope comprise data structures where each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process

1 the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the  
2 network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request*  
3 *for that entity to perform a task.* Therefore, the Fuisz-Gupta combination cannot  
4 teach or suggest a computer-readable storage medium having computer executable  
5 instructions that, when executed by a computer, perform the recited method.

6 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
7 features recited in claim 49. Accordingly, claim 49 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
8 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
9 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 49 be  
10 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

#### 11 12 Claim 50

13 Claim 50 recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-  
14 executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a method of  
15 delivering a message between entities on a network, the method comprising:

- 16
- 17 • transmitting a message envelope of a message from an origin entity  
to a destination entity via one or more intermediate entities on the  
network;
  - 18 • the message envelope having contents comprising data structures,  
each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process the  
19 data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over  
the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an*  
20 *explicit request for the destination entity to perform a task.*  
21 (Emphasis added).

22 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
23 arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in  
24 response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach  
25



1 or suggest a method of delivering a message in which the message envelope  
2 contents comprise data structures where each data structure identifies which entity  
3 is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message  
4 envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes*  
5 *an explicit request for the destination entity to perform a task.* Therefore, the  
6 Fuisz-Gupta combination cannot teach or suggest a computer-readable storage  
7 medium having computer executable instructions that, when executed by a  
8 computer, perform the recited method.

9 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
10 features recited in claim 50. Accordingly, claim 50 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
11 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
12 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 50 be  
13 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

14  
15 **Claim 51**

16 **Claim 51** recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-  
17 executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a method of  
18 parsing a message received by a receiving entity over a network from a sending  
19 entity, the method comprising:

- 20 • parsing a message envelope of a message;
- 21 • parsing contents of the message envelope, the contents comprising  
22 data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is intended  
23 to process the data structure when that entity receives the message  
24 envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data*  
25 *structures includes an explicit request for the receiving entity to*  
*perform a task.* (Emphasis added).

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
2 arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in  
3 response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach  
4 or suggest a method of parsing a message where the contents of the message  
5 envelope comprise data structures in which each data structure identifies which  
6 entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the  
7 message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures*  
8 *includes an explicit request for the receiving entity to perform a task.* Therefore,  
9 the Fuisz-Gupta combination cannot teach or suggest a computer-readable storage  
10 medium having computer executable instructions that, when executed by a  
11 computer, perform the recited method.

12 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
13 features recited in claim 51. Accordingly, claim 51 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
14 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
15 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 51 be  
16 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

17  
18 **Claim 52**

19 **Claim 52** recites a message exchange apparatus comprising:

- 20
- a processor;
  - a message formatter executable on the processor to:
    - generate a message envelope of a message;
    - generate contents of the message envelope, the contents comprising data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for that entity to perform a task.*
- 25

1  
2 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
3 arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in  
4 response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach  
5 or suggest a message exchange apparatus in which the contents of the message  
6 envelope comprise data structures where each data structure identifies which entity  
7 is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message  
8 envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes*  
9 *an explicit request for that entity to perform a task.*

10 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
11 features recited in claim 51. Accordingly, claim 51 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
12 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
13 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 51 be  
14 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

15  
16 **Claim 53**

17 **Claim 53** recites a message exchange apparatus comprising:

- 18
- a processor;
  - a message deliverer executable on the processor to:
    - transmit a message envelope of a message from an origin entity to a destination entity via one or more intermediate entities on the network;
    - the message envelope having contents comprising data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for the destination entity to perform a task.* (Emphasis added).
- 25

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
2 arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in  
3 response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach  
4 or suggest a message deliverer in which the message envelope contents comprise  
5 data structures where each data structure identifies which entity is intended to  
6 process the data structure when that entity receives the message envelope over the  
7 network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request*  
8 *for the destination entity to perform a task.*

9 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
10 features recited in claim 53. Accordingly, claim 53 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
11 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
12 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 53 be  
13 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

14  
15 **Claim 54**

16 **Claim 54** recites a message exchange apparatus comprising:

- 17
- a processor;
  - a message parser executable on the processor to:
    - 18 ○ parse a message envelope of a message;
    - 19 ○ parse contents of the message envelope, the contents comprising  
20 data structures, each data structure identifies which entity is  
21 intended to process the data structure when that entity receives  
22 the message envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of*  
*the data structures includes an explicit request for that entity to*  
*perform a task.* (Emphasis added).

23 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
24 arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in  
25 response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach

1 or suggest a message exchange apparatus in which the message envelope contents  
2 comprise data structures where each data structure identifies which entity is  
3 intended to process the data structure when that entity receives the message  
4 envelope over the network, *wherein at least one of the data structures includes*  
5 *an explicit request for that entity to perform a task.*

6 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
7 features recited in claim 54. Accordingly, claim 54 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
8 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
9 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 54 be  
10 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

11 **Claims 55-57**

12 **Claim 55** recites a message envelope generated in accordance with the  
13 following acts:

- 14
- 15 • providing a sending entity in communication with a network of  
entities;
  - 16 • generating contents of the message envelope of a message, the  
contents comprising:
  - 17 • a header data structure which identifies an intermediate entity as that  
18 which is intended to process the header data structure and whether  
that intermediate entity must understand such data structure; and
  - 19 • a body data structure which identifies a destination entity as that  
20 which is intended to process the body data structure,
  - 21 • *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit  
request for at least one of the entities to perform a task.* (Emphasis  
22 added).

23 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
24 arguments that it did when rejecting claims 1 and 2. For the reasons noted above in  
25 response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach

1 or suggest that *at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for*  
2 *at least one of the entities to perform a task*. Lefebvre fails to cure this deficiency  
3 of the Fuisz-Gupta combination, as Lefebvre does not teach or suggest that at least  
4 one of the data structures includes an explicit request for at least one of the entities  
5 to perform a task, and the Office has not cited Lefebvre as disclosing such.  
6 Therefore, the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination cannot disclose or suggest a  
7 message envelope generated in accordance with the acts recited in claim 55.

8 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination fails to teach or suggest all  
9 the features recited in claim 55. Accordingly, claim 55 is allowable over the  
10 Fuisz-Gupta- Lefebvre combination for at least the reason described above, and  
11 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that  
12 claim 55 be allowed in the Examiner's next action.

13 Claims 56-57 are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination by  
14 virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 55, and are allowable for at the  
15 same reasons that base claim 55 is allowable. In addition, each of these claims  
16 may be also be allowable on their own merits. Applicant requests that the Office  
17 withdraw the rejection of each of these dependent claims because its base claim is  
18 allowable.

**Claims 58-60**

**Claim 58** recites a modulated data signal having computer-executable instructions embodied thereon comprising:

- a header data structure which identifies an intermediate entity, over a network of entities, as that which is intended to process the header data structure and whether that intermediate entity must understand such data structure; and
- a body data structure which identifies the destination entity as that which is intended to process the body data structure,
- *wherein at least one of the data structures includes and explicit request for at least one of the entities to perform a task.* (Emphasis added).

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same arguments that it did when rejecting claims 1 and 2. For the reasons noted above in response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach or suggest that *at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for at least one of the entities to perform a task.* Lefebvre fails to cure this deficiency of the Fuisz-Gupta combination, as Lefebvre does not teach or suggest that at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for at least one of the entities to perform a task, and the Office has not cited Lefebvre as disclosing such.

As such, the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in claim 58. Accordingly, claim 58 is allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta- Lefebvre combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 58 be allowed in the Examiner's next action.

**Claims 59-60** are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 58, and are allowable for at least

1 the same reasons that base claim 58 is allowable. In addition, each of these claims  
2 may be also be allowable on their own merits. Applicant requests that the Office  
3 withdraw the rejection of each of these dependent claims because its base claim is  
4 allowable.

5  
6 **Claims 61-63**

7 **Claim 61** recites a computer-readable medium having a data structure  
8 embodied thereon comprising:

- 9
- 10 • a header data-structure section which identifies an intermediate  
11 entity, over a network of entities, as that which is intended to process  
12 the header data-structure section and whether that intermediate entity  
13 must understand such data-structure section; and
  - 14 • a body data-structure section which identifies the destination entity  
15 as that which is intended to process the body data-structure section,
  - 16 • *wherein at least one of the data structures includes an explicit  
17 request for at least one of the entities to perform a task.* (Emphasis  
18 added).

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
20 arguments that it did when rejecting claims 1 and 2. For the reasons noted above  
21 in response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach  
22 or suggest that *at least one of the data structures includes an explicit request for  
23 at least one of the entities to perform a task.* Lefebvre fails to cure this deficiency  
24 of the Fuisz-Gupta combination, as Lefebvre does not teach or suggest that at least  
25 one of the data structures includes an explicit request for at least one of the entities  
to perform a task, and the Office has not cited Lefebvre as disclosing such.

As such, the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination fails to teach or suggest all  
the features recited in claim 61. Accordingly, claim 61 is allowable over the



1 Fuisz-Gupta- Lefebvre combination for at least the reason described above, and  
2 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that  
3 claim 61 be allowed in the Examiner's next action.

4 **Claims 62-63** are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination by  
5 virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 61, and are allowable for at least  
6 the same reasons that base claim 61 is allowable. In addition, each of these claims  
7 may be also be allowable on their own merits. Applicant requests that the Office  
8 withdraw the rejection of each of these dependent claims because its base claim is  
9 allowable.

10  
11 **Claims 64-79**

12 **Claim 64** recites a method of formatting a message for exchange between  
13 entities on a network, the method comprising:

- 14 • generating a message envelope of a message, *the message*  
15 *comprising at least one explicit request by one entity on a network*  
16 *of another entity on the network to perform a task;*  
17 • generating contents of the message envelope, the contents  
18 comprising data structures, each data structure identifies which  
entity is intended to process the data structure when that entity  
receives the message envelope over the network. (Emphasis added).

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same  
20 arguments that it did when rejecting claim 1. For the reasons noted above in  
21 response to the rejection of claim 1, the Fuisz-Gupta combination does not teach  
22 or suggest a method of formatting a message for exchange between entities on a  
23 network, the method comprising generating a message envelope of a message, *the*  
24  
25

1 *message comprising at least one explicit request by one entity on a network of*  
2 *another entity on the network to perform a task.*

3 As such, the Fuisz-Gupta combination fails to teach or suggest all the  
4 features recited in claim 64. Accordingly, claim 64 is allowable over the Fuisz-  
5 Gupta combination for at least the reason described above, and Applicant  
6 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that the claim 64  
7 be allowed in the Examiner's next action.

8 **Claims 68 and 70-77** depend ultimately from independent claim 64, and  
9 are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta combination for at least the reason described  
10 above in response to the rejection of claim 64. Applicant respectfully requests that  
11 the Office withdraw the rejection of each of these dependent claims because the  
12 base claim is allowable.

13 **Claim 65** is allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination by  
14 virtue of its dependency upon allowable claim 64. Claim 65 is also allowable over  
15 the Fuisz-Gupta-Lefebvre combination because Lefebvre does not address the  
16 deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described above in response to the rejection  
17 of claim 64, and the Office has not cited Lefebvre as curing theses deficiencies.

18 **Claim 66** is allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Morelli combination by virtue  
19 of its dependency upon allowable claim 64. Claim 66 is also allowable over the  
20 Fuisz-Gupta-Morelli combination because Morelli does not address the  
21 deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as described above in response to the rejection  
22 of claim 64, and the Office has not cited Morelli as curing theses deficiencies.

23 **Claims 67, 69, 78 and 79** are allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly  
24 combination by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 64. Claims 67,  
25 69, 78 and 79 are also allowable over the Fuisz-Gupta-Connolly combination

1 because Connolly does not address the deficiencies of Fuisz and/or Gupta as  
2 described above in response to the rejection of claim 64.

3 **Conclusion**

4 All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully  
5 requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues  
6 remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the  
7 undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.  
8

9 Respectfully Submitted,

10  
11 Dated: 9-6-05

12 By: 

13 Kasey C. Christie  
14 Reg. No. 60559  
15 (509) 324-9256 x232  
16 [kasey@leehayes.com](mailto:kasey@leehayes.com)  
17 [www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25